VIA E-MAIL

**#FOLEY** 

- 1

March 16, 2006

FOLEY & LANDWER LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

₹ ₹

WASHINGTON HARBOUR 3000 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007-5143 202-672-5300 TEL 202-672-5300 FAX WWW.foley.com

WRITER'S DIRECT LINE 202.295.4081 croficheli@feley.com EMAIL

CLIENT/MATTER NUMBER

Ms. Beth Mizzuno Staff Attorney Federal Election Commission 999 B Street, NW

VIA FACERHILE (202) 219-3923

Re: MUR 5789 - Request for Extension of Time to File Response

Dear Ms. Mizzuno:

Washington, DC 20643

I represent the Gallagher for Senate committee ("the Committee") in the above-referenced Matter Under Review ("MUR"). This is to follow up on our telephone conversation of this morning. As I indicated today, my client received the Reason to Believe letter from the Federal Election Commission no earlier than March 9, 2006. I was out of town until Monday of this week when I was able to review the letter for the first time and scheduled a conference with my client for Tuesday of this week (day before yesterday). I received the signed Statement of Designation of Counsel from my client yesterday which was filed at the FEC this morning. I then called you as per the instructions in your letter and received your voicemail. In my voicemail message, I advised you that I had just filed the Statement of Designation of Counsel and would be requesting an extension of time to file a response to the RTB Finding. According to my calculations, absent an extension, my client's response would be due one week from tomorrow, or SIX business days from the filing of my appointment as counsel.

You indicated on the phone that the anticipated request for extension "would not be granted". You offered NO reason other than that you had been instructed to advise me that no extension would be granted. The timeline regarding this MUR is as follows:

The facts at issue in this MUR occurred in June, 2004.

The amended FEC report was filed on September 9, 2004.

The Request For Additional Information was issued on September 21, 2004

The Termination Report was filed on November 28, 2005.

The RTB Finding was issued on February 27, 2006 and received by my client on March 9, 2006.

BOSTON BAUDGELS CHICAGO DETROST MANAGER MANAGER MANAGER MANAGER MANAGER MEN YORK OTLANDO SACRAMENTO SAN DISCO

BAN DIBBO/DEL MAR BAN PRANCISCO BILICÓN WALLEY TALLAMAGGE Tampa Tokyo Washinston, D.C. West Palm Seach **FOLEY** 

= 1

Ms. Beth Mizzuno March 16, 2006 Page 2

Your agency has taken almost two years to decide to act in this matter, seventuen months between the receipt of the response to the RFAI from the Committee and three months from the filing of the Termination Report to issue an RTB Finding.

: 3

You didn't even give me an opportunity to tell you how much time I am requesting for an extension before you told me that NO extension will be granted. In other words, you denied the request before it was even made.

The decial of the request (before it was even made) is an abuse of the Agency's discretion. This Committee involves a candidate who lost a primary election in the *prior* election cycle — and the Commission has certainly not indicated by its own actions (and inaction) that there is any urgency involving this matter. The Committee is awaiting termination because its purpose has long since been concluded. There is absolutely no cause or reason for denying the request for an extension. There is no harm or injury to anyone in allowing the Committee the time necessary to develop the facts and documentation necessary to respond fully and properly to the RTB Finding.

The reason for the extension request (which is being filed more than five days prior to the original response date) is for good cause. The Committee is inactive and has been inactive for eighteen (18) months. It will, therefore, be necessary to retrieve records from storage and to try to reconstruct the facts that are required to defend this MUR, to locate people and to develop an appropriate response. Further, no attachments were included in the RTB notice from your office and the Committee's response to the RFAI at issue in this MUR, while referenced in the RTB Finding, is neither attached nor is it posted on the Commission's website. As Counsel to the Committee, I do not have a copy of the RFAI Response which is central to my ability to adequately represent my client in this MUR. The Committee's records must be retrieved and then searched in order to obtain the documents pertinent to this MUR.

Accordingly, please consider this the Committee's formal request for an extension of time to respond to the RTB Finding to April 14, 2006, or twenty (20) days from the original response date of March 24, 2006.

Should your office determine not to reconsider its decision (already made prior to this request being tendered), please advise in writing of your reason(s) for doing so.

Please contact me at (202) 295-4081 if you have any questions.

Sincerely.

Cleta Mitchell, Esq.

Counsel for Gallagher for Senate

Clife Oriedel

CMI:cmi

: 3

## **#FOLEY**

Ms. Beth Mizzuno March 16, 2006 Page 3

cc: Mr. Doug Gallagher

Mr. Kenneth Lancaster

Mr. Lawrence Norton, FEC General Counsel

÷ 3